

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
 From: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
 Subject: Formal responses to RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev – Proposal to Revise Definitions of *Aggregate*, *Aggregating Work* and *Aggregates Guidance*.

This document collates in tabular form the responses received from voting members of the RSC to [RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev](#) viz.:

- [RSC/ TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev/EURIG response](#)
- [RSC/ TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev/ExamplesEditor](#)
- [RSC/ TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev/NARDAC response](#)
- [RSC/ TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev/ORDAC response](#)
- [RSC/ TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev/TranslationsTLO](#)
- [RSC/ TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev/WCEO response](#)

Recommendation 1	Approved by 5: EURIG , Examples Editor , ORDAC , TranslationsTLO , WCEO Rejected by 1: NARDAC	Note 1: Having rejected the proposal, NARDAC shares 4 pages of suggested edits, including an alternative wording for this recommendation.
Recommendation 2	Approved by 5: EURIG , Examples Editor , ORDAC , TranslationsTLO , WCEO Rejected by 1: NARDAC	Note 1: Having rejected the proposal, NARDAC shares 4 pages of suggested edits, including an alternative wording for this recommendation.
Recommendation 3	Approved by 4: EURIG , ORDAC , TranslationsTLO , WCEO Approved with suggested edits by 1: Examples Editor , TranslationsTLO , WCEO Rejected by 1: NARDAC	Note 1: Having rejected the proposal, NARDAC shares 4 pages of suggested edits, including an alternative wording for this recommendation. Note 2: Examples Editor would like to retain the original order in the Toolkit to reflect the flow of the WEMI model. Note 3: Examples Editor suggests an addition to the wording. Note 4: Examples Editor calls for a diagram based on the WEMI model to be included.

General Remarks		<p>Note 5: EURIG calls for examples and diagrams. See also Note 4 and the Appendix to RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev/NARDAC response</p> <p>Note on process from the RSC Secretary</p>
-----------------	--	---

Note 1

Having rejected all the recommendations, NARDAC has made suggestions for alternative wording of each recommendation, against the outcome that a majority vote leads to the acceptance of this proposal.

Note 2

[Examples Editor](#) would like to “retain the original order of contents in the Toolkit for the Aggregates guidance chapter (i.e., ‘Aggregating expressions’ before ‘Aggregating works’). This order logically follows the flow of the WEMI model.”

Note 3

[Examples Editor](#) suggests the following amendment (mark-up reflects change from text in proposal):

“Under ‘Aggregate manifestations,’ add text to second paragraph:

In addition to the distinct expressions that are aggregated. An aggregate also embodies one and only one aggregating expression that realizes one and only one aggregating work that is the plan for selecting and arranging the expressions that are embodied in an aggregate.

This addition helps to clarify the difference between aggregates and aggregating expressions”

Note 4

[Examples Editor](#) suggests the addition of a diagram, “perhaps one based on the diagram illustrating the model for aggregates in the LRM”.

Note 5

[EURIG](#) suggests, “As this change is, in large part, to support education and training, we feel that the terms would benefit from illustrative examples and diagrams which would be useful in the classroom”.

Note on process from the RSC Secretary

Having discussed it with the RSC Chair, I wanted to make a comment on NARDAC’s rejection of all proposals while suggesting specific wording changes in case their rejection does not carry the discussion in their favour. While not doubting that this is intended to be helpful, it conflates two stages of the discussion process and makes the presentation of what is intended as helpful information sound defensive and possibly

even adversarial. There has been an upward creep in this sort of response from RSC members – it is not solely an issue for the NARDAC representative. However, this response is, perhaps, a tipping point, and it would be worthwhile, I think, for the voting members of the RSC to discuss the procedure for what to do when they want to reject a recommendation but also want to be helpful if the recommendation is approved. If we can discuss this in the Executive Session of this RSC meeting, I can include the decision made in the Operations Documents as appropriate. The annual review of the Operations Documents is also under discussion at this meeting, so the timing of this discussion would be good.

With regard to RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev/NARDAC response, I am suggesting here that voting members take its suggestions for rewording of specific recommendations into account at the appropriate time in their discussion of RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev. The response is set out in a clear order, so you can see where each rewording is set out.